

3638

— G-000-1004.13 —

**US DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY FERNALD  
ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROJECT  
COMMUNITY MEETING JULY 21, 1992**

**07/21/92**

**88  
TRANSCRIPT**

3638

US DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY  
FERNALD ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROJECT  
COMMUNITY MEETING

July 21, 1992

Spangler Reporting Services

(513) 381-3330

001

1 MR. TILLER: Good evening, ladies  
2 and gentlemen. I wonder if we could ask you to  
3 take your seat.

4 In keeping with the Fernald  
5 tradition, we're going to try to stay on schedule.  
6 The agenda I noticed, as was pointed out, has an  
7 ending time of 9:30, and someone also mentioned  
8 that they haven't seen any of them end at 9:30.  
9 We're going to try something substantially the same  
10 but a little different tonight. I've asked the  
11 people who are giving the presentations to be a  
12 little more brief. I've had the impression at the  
13 last two of these I've been to, that occasionally I  
14 see some very glazed and bored eyes, so we would  
15 rather hit the high spots in a little terser  
16 fashion, and, if necessary, we'll leave all the  
17 time that's required for questions.

18 Also, I mentioned this morning when I  
19 came to work, I felt like the environment at the  
20 office was different, and I couldn't understand  
21 it. Then I noticed that Wally, Rod, Johnny had  
22 ties on, Carlos had a tie on, Randi didn't have her  
23 Levis on, and I thought oh, my goodness, it's  
24 community meeting night.

1                   On behalf of the Department and the  
2 contractors, I would like to welcome you here. I  
3 hope we provide the information that you're  
4 interested in, and if we are able to be terser  
5 tonight and a little quicker, I would appreciate  
6 some feedback as to whether you think that's an  
7 improvement or not.

8                   Before we get into the items we're  
9 going to discuss, we had one last brainstorming  
10 session this morning to see if we could remember  
11 anything that we may have inadvertently omitted  
12 providing to you, and there was one thing. We're  
13 going to have a fairly large emergency exercise  
14 drill in August and September. We're going to have  
15 a preliminary drill on August 21, and the final  
16 exercise will be September 12. The reason for  
17 mentioning that is part of the exercise is going to  
18 involve some activity off the site and near it, and  
19 to the person that would be surprised by that, it  
20 may look like an accident or an off-normal  
21 situation. If you see that on September 12, it is  
22 almost certainly part of our exercise. We are not  
23 giving the details of the exercise out in order to  
24 make it more meaningful.

1 I think the first viewgraph of the  
2 four items I'm going to touch briefly, I'm going to  
3 set an example, there's not a lot to say on ERMC  
4 that you probably don't know. The short list is  
5 down to three. The item of interest I think is  
6 that the schedule is being maintained to brief the  
7 source election official, and I have been invited  
8 to that and Pat Whitfield has been invited. We'll  
9 have a briefing probably the first week in August  
10 with an announcement later in the month of August  
11 holding to a schedule to have the transition  
12 contract in place on September 1.

13 The boiler fire -- why don't you show  
14 the next one.

15 We're improving the monitoring  
16 system, improving the water supply and fire  
17 protection and training. The report that was  
18 prepared is in the public room and is available. I  
19 would point out that our report was submitted to  
20 headquarters for their review. It was reviewed and  
21 was finally issued without any changes whatever by  
22 headquarters, so I think we did a pretty good job  
23 here locally of highlighting the deficiencies  
24 there. Other than that, I wasn't going to say

3638

1 anything. Go back to the first one.

2 EMAC, and I've got the name down  
3 here, Environmental Restoration and Waste  
4 Management Advisory Committee, a new committee that  
5 was appointed by the Secretary of Energy, and it is  
6 a broad spectrum of academe, people like yourselves  
7 that are interested in the environment, people in  
8 the environmental field. It will be an advisory  
9 group to the assistant secretary for environmental  
10 restoration. Right now that's Leo Duffy, and I  
11 would point out that Vicki Dastillung is a member.  
12 Let's have a little hand for Vicki.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. TILLER: Tom Winston of the Ohio  
15 EPA is also a member. It will meet four times a  
16 year approximately. The first one is in early  
17 August in Washington, DC.

18 Last item is our staffing. In  
19 February, about two or three days after the meeting  
20 we had here in February, the secretary approved the  
21 Fernald organization, and it's more than an  
22 organization, it's a charter and a goal for us, and  
23 it will take us to a self-sufficient, stand-alone  
24 field office. We are now a field office by name,

1 and I would point out this is the first field  
2 office by name in over 40 years, which gives you  
3 some indication of the priority. We have a charter  
4 to go to somewhat over 200 people. Our staffing  
5 allocation for this fiscal year was pegged at 69.  
6 The Department across the complex is having trouble  
7 with government slots, they don't have as many  
8 slots as they had needs. Right now we're holding  
9 to that, and we probably have 55 on board or  
10 offers. We're almost at 50 on board as compared  
11 with 23 when I arrived here. So we're building the  
12 staff and we're looking forward to it.

13           Introduce three new people. Director  
14 of External Affairs is Ken Morgan. Ken, would you  
15 stand up. He just came in, we got him from  
16 Richmond, we're glad to have him. We have a Public  
17 Affairs Specialist, Gary Stegner. And from Mound,  
18 the number two DOE person there has joined our  
19 staff, George Gartrell. Where is George? George  
20 is in the back. And we're pleased to have him.

21           In addition to the new faces, as we  
22 are advertising these jobs, we are also filling  
23 some supervisory positions within the office, and  
24 three people that are in our staff and have been

1 here have been promoted in the last month, and I'd  
2 like you to meet Randi Allen, Rod Warner, and  
3 Johnny Reising. We are pleased that they were  
4 selected for promotions in a competitive field.  
5 We're not through with this process, and there may  
6 be more, but we're pleased to be able to provide  
7 that opportunity for these people.

8 With that, I think Jerry is next.

9 Let me see if I have any more notes. I have very  
10 large notes so I didn't have to use my glasses.  
11 I'm out of notes, and Jerry is next and is going to  
12 talk about some things, including public water, et  
13 cetera.

14 MR. WESTERBECK: Thanks, Bob. With  
15 regard to public water -- I should get cowboy boots  
16 so I could be taller too. DOE, we have reviewed  
17 the consultant's report that was provided to the  
18 Hamilton County Department of Public Works, and in  
19 that report the consultant had recommended that the  
20 DOE's fair share was 4.1 million. Westinghouse  
21 also took a look at the cost estimate provided by  
22 the consultant, and they came up with a figure very  
23 similar, around 4.2 million as being DOE's fair  
24 share. When we got the report formally provided to



1 us from the Hamilton County people, they suggested  
2 that we pay, DOE pay for the entire project, that  
3 entire phase, which is around 9.1 million.

4 Just today at their request we did  
5 send them a copy of our South Plume EE/CA document,  
6 that Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis, that  
7 went into great detail in studying the extent and  
8 projected extent of the contamination associated  
9 with the South Plume. As I said, the Department of  
10 Public Works asked that we provide that to them.  
11 They're going to give that to their consultant, we  
12 understand, essentially for their consultant to see  
13 if they agree with our analysis of the impacted  
14 area, and hopefully then after that we can come  
15 together on, and agree on what our fair share is.

16 I think one point that we all must  
17 keep in mind is that federal law does prohibit DOE  
18 from paying for a water system outside the  
19 contaminated area. We're restricted to provide  
20 public money or public water only to those people  
21 whose water source had been impacted or potentially  
22 could be impacted by the contamination. Meanwhile,  
23 we'll continue to keep pushing on the project and  
24 keep you informed of just what is happening in that

1 area.

2 In fact, I believe Crosby Township is  
3 hosting a meeting on the public water system on the  
4 5th of August, I believe, and we are invited, as is  
5 the Department of Public Works.

6 Moving on to the next item, at the  
7 last community meeting in February, I promised you  
8 an outline of the community environmental education  
9 course that we will be offering during the months  
10 of September, October and November. On your  
11 chairs, if everything worked right, you should have  
12 found an outline of the course, and we have sign-up  
13 sheets, my notes say in the back of room. Is that  
14 true or is it over here? In the back of the room,  
15 great. Now, the copy of the sign-up sheets I got  
16 didn't have the sheet for October 20th. Hopefully  
17 October 20th is back there. We inserted one  
18 additional course in there. Originally it was  
19 seven different topics, seven different weeks. We  
20 added one more to have Parsons come in and brief  
21 anyone interested in their role in the remediation  
22 process, i.e., their development of designs of the  
23 remedial activities to show you how the  
24 computer-aided design is used.

1                   So please, if you would, fill out  
2 your sheet and return it to the folks at the  
3 registration table during the break or at the end  
4 of the evening. If you want to fill out your  
5 sign-up sheet later, that's fine, just mail it back  
6 to us or drop it off at the PEIC. We use the  
7 sign-up sheets, of course, for our planning  
8 purposes, so if you think you may be able to  
9 attend, go ahead and sign up, and at an  
10 appropriate, like a week or two before we have the  
11 session, we'll send you out a reminder.

12                   I would like to thank the four or  
13 five folks who did work with us in reviewing the  
14 schedule and the topics that we proposed to talk  
15 about. Your input was valuable, and I think it's  
16 going to result in a very informative and valuable  
17 course for everyone to attend.

18                   Also at our last community meeting I  
19 briefly mentioned DOE's public participation plan.  
20 It's designed to obtain community members' comments  
21 on a variety of key planning documents. Since  
22 February, I think we accomplished quite a bit. In  
23 May, May 11th, we held a preliminary workshop to  
24 lay out our plan to the community members who had

1 signed up to be a part of the review group, and at  
2 that meeting we also did look at the activity data  
3 sheets for Fernald.

4 Then on June 8th we held a general  
5 orientation session for everyone to explain the  
6 initiative to the community at large. We had over  
7 40 people at that session and received numerous  
8 comments about the review process and how people  
9 can best be informed of these sessions. And I  
10 think we've incorporated all of the suggestions.

11 On July 16th we put in the mail a  
12 letter reminding those who had signed up to review  
13 the site specific plan and a draft of the Fernald  
14 input to the five-year plan. That review will be  
15 held on August 3rd. In the letter we also said  
16 that copies, your copies would be available at the  
17 PEIC for you to pick up. If you can't make it by  
18 there to pick it up, please give Jacquia Shoulders  
19 in our office a call and she'll mail it out to  
20 you. Her number is 738-9348, and that's included  
21 in the letter. If you didn't sign up before, go  
22 ahead and fill out -- and you want to participate,  
23 why please feel free to fill out a sign-up sheet at  
24 the registration table.

Spangler Reporting Services

(513) 381-3330

1                   Last item, the PEIS, as you recall,  
2   April 2nd in Cincinnati we held a workshop,  
3   headquarters put on a workshop to discuss the draft  
4   implementation plan. If you can remember, no  
5   meeting was originally scheduled for this area.  
6   However, as a result of a request at our last  
7   community meeting, we approached headquarters, and  
8   I guess you might say convinced them of the  
9   importance of holding a meeting in Cincinnati, and  
10   they agreed to do that.

11                   MS. CRAWFORD: I think threatened is  
12   a better word.

13                   MR. WESTERBECK: Along with many of  
14   you, I attended the session and felt the exchange  
15   was very good and very productive. In talking with  
16   Glenn Showbloom, who is heading up that effort at  
17   the headquarters, and his staff who organized the  
18   meeting, they too felt that the Cincinnati session  
19   was one of the best in the country. There was a  
20   total of six.

21                   I'd like to add my congratulations to  
22   Vicki and Tom Winston for getting selected to that  
23   committee. There's only 23 people in the whole  
24   country who have been selected for that advisory

1 committee. The committee's main focus will be on  
2 the PEIS. However, Glen did sort of indicate to me  
3 that they might try to get the committee to get  
4 involved in some other things, but the main focus  
5 is the PEIS.

6 After they hold a getting organized  
7 meeting in Washington the first part of August, we  
8 will likely host the next meeting out here in  
9 September, late September. The current -- they're  
10 going to come out after the meeting in Washington  
11 and work out a lot of the specifics with us, but it  
12 looks like they're going to have about a day and a  
13 half session for the committee. The first day will  
14 be briefings primary on Fernald and perhaps some of  
15 the surrounding DOE facilities. Of course, a  
16 session where they discuss the draft final  
17 implementation plan for the PEIS, and then in the  
18 evening, so sort of jot this down in your mind,  
19 we're looking at the end of September, towards the  
20 end of September, they plan to have a public  
21 comment period. The next day then the committee  
22 will take a tour of the Fernald site and the  
23 surrounding area.

24 So I think we should feel quite

3638

1 proud, I know I am, that they selected us to be the  
2 first out of Washington site, if you will, to host  
3 the committee, and again we'll keep you informed of  
4 that. Thank you.

5 Ray, are you up?

6 MR. HANSEN: Yep.

7 MR. WESTERBECK: Good.

8 MR. HANSEN: Thank you, Jerry. Good  
9 evening. My topic is safe shutdown and waste  
10 shipments. As I've told you once before, the safe  
11 shutdown program is basically to get all the  
12 facilities on-site ready for D&D, which means clean  
13 out of equipment, materials disposition, and also  
14 I'm going to talk about the waste shipments.

15 If you remember, we had our  
16 transition from DP to EM in October of 1990. At  
17 that time I think we reported to you we had some  
18 51,000,000 pounds of uranium materials on-site at  
19 that time. We have shipped off-site 1,435 metric  
20 tons -- a metric ton for those who don't know, if  
21 you're old like I am, when you were in grade  
22 school, you were taught that there was a short ton  
23 and a long ton. The short ton was 2,000 pounds,  
24 and that's the standard English ton; the metric ton

1 is 2,200 pounds. So if I confuse you with metric  
2 tons, it's 2,200 pounds per metric ton.

3 We shipped off 1,435 metric tons of  
4 materials; 547 of that was Army product which went  
5 to the customer, the Army; 602 metric tons which  
6 went to Y-12. That was basically the end of our  
7 production stream, materials going to Y-12 in Oak  
8 Ridge. Eight metric tons of derbys went to  
9 Lawrence Livermore. That is for development work  
10 in what is called the Atlas program, the atomic  
11 vapor laser isotope separation process. This chart  
12 says 272 metric tons of  $UF_4$  to the Army. As of  
13 today it's 346 metric tons, and 6 metric tons of  
14 miscellaneous materials to other DOE sites.

15 Our immediate plans for safe  
16 shutdown. We did complete the transfer of 346  
17 metric tons, that's 1.8 million pounds of  $UF_4$  to  
18 the Army, the last shipment left today. We're  
19 working to ship, as you know, by rail 2,838 metric  
20 tons of Army metal, the first two shipments went  
21 off-site, arrived at their destination safely. We  
22 intend to get one or two more this week, depending  
23 on our packaging schedule.

24 Originally scheduled, we intended to



1 get that material off-site by December of this  
2 year. The Army is now looking at recovery of some  
3 of that material. It was destined for burial at  
4 Barnwell, South Carolina. They're now looking at  
5 perhaps burying it at Nevada test site. The  
6 reasons being that they may have to recover that  
7 material in the future. Should that decision be  
8 made, then we will not ship by rail, we'll ship  
9 that material by truck, and we're looking at a  
10 March completion date for shipment of those  
11 materials.

12 We have two requests for proposal on  
13 the street, and I'll talk a little later about  
14 those. Next slide, please.

15 Thorium activities on-site include  
16 characterization, stabilization, overpacking, and,  
17 of course, shipping. We kind of boiled that down  
18 into three categories. Of the total of 1,100  
19 metric tons we have on-site, there's a pending sale  
20 to the private sector of 149 metric tons. We  
21 expect that to be complete and shipped off-site by  
22 September of this year, we're hoping. It all  
23 depends on the company's license renewal.

24 We reported to you last year that

1 some 496 metric tons of thorium had been declared  
2 waste. That allowed us to proceed with getting  
3 permission from Nevada to ship that material. June  
4 12th of this year all other waste, all other  
5 thorium on-site was declared waste. We also have  
6 some materials called thorium nitrate, very much  
7 like our uranyl nitrate that we're working with  
8 right now, approximately 9 metric tons of that.  
9 That will have to be stabilized before it can be  
10 shipped.

11 In characterization of thorium, of  
12 the 15,000 drums of thorium, some odd 15,000 drums  
13 that we have on-site, we've determined that 39 of  
14 those are RCRA and will not be shipped to Nevada.  
15 Two of the 15,000 are left to be evaluated. Those  
16 basically are contained in Building 65, and we  
17 won't get to those until we start the overpacking  
18 of Building 65. The reason being to cut down the  
19 exposure to our people.

20 Stabilization of thorium nitrate, we  
21 expect that to start October of this year, and it  
22 will take us approximately until November of 1993  
23 to complete that.

24 Overpacking, our FY-92 goal was to

1 complete the overpacking in Building 64, 67, and  
2 68. We have completed 64 and 68; 67 is being held  
3 up. As you know, we had an explosion of a drum  
4 on-site, and I'll discuss that later, but basically  
5 what we did when that happened was stop all drum  
6 movements. But we'll look at starting Building 67  
7 shortly.

8 Schedules for shipments off-site of  
9 thorium, the pending sale once again, we expect to  
10 have that in place and sold and get it off by  
11 September 30th. All of our waste we're looking to  
12 get off-site, the thorium waste, by the end of  
13 fiscal year 1994. We expect about 100 drums of  
14 residues from the thorium nitrate stabilization  
15 process. Those will take us about a month after  
16 we've completed the stabilization to ship those 100  
17 drums off-site.

18 All shipments, of course, go to the  
19 Nevada test site. Today I'm pleased to announce we  
20 did make our 7th shipment of thorium to Nevada.  
21 That's a total of 277 drums. We still think we can  
22 make our original September 30th date to get the  
23 original 1,624 drums of thorium off-site.

24 Other waste shipments, although the

1 slide says June, I would like to bring you  
2 up-to-date as of today. Our goal for July was  
3 80,280 drums. As of today we have shipped 78,550  
4 drum equivalents to Nevada.

5 Now, we mentioned a request for  
6 proposals. If you'll remember, we gave you a goal  
7 for this year to ship off-site 150,000 drum  
8 equivalents of material or waste or residues  
9 off-site. Of that we were looking to ship 100,000  
10 drum equivalents of waste materials. We did put  
11 out two requests for proposals and got two bids or  
12 let bids, and actually awarded one contract on  
13 25,000 drum equivalents of scrap metal. The  
14 contract award date was June 19th. We have yet to  
15 submit a work plan to US EPA on that. We expect to  
16 have the contractor on-site if everything goes well  
17 August 24th. We also let a contract or let a  
18 request for proposal for a contract to get off  
19 50,000 drums of residues on-site. Although the  
20 slide says contract pending approval, I was on the  
21 phone today and I guess I applied enough pressure,  
22 they did approve it. So I can say that that was  
23 approved today.

24 We also intend to issue an RFP for

3638

1 the copper on-site. We've got some 1,350 tons of  
2 copper on-site. That copper, as you may or may not  
3 know, is contaminated copper. It also is wrapped  
4 with asbestos.

5                   On June 17th, I think most of you are  
6 aware, we had a drum incident where we had a drum  
7 explode. I think to explain this we need to go  
8 back to '89 when we had what was our last  
9 occurrence of a drum exploding. What we did was go  
10 through and vent approximately 10,000 drums,  
11 basically put holes in the sides of the drum or the  
12 lid to allow hydrogen to escape. Of those 10,000  
13 drums, those that were stored inside remained  
14 opened. Those that were stored outside, we put in  
15 what we call a little vent plug. It's basically a  
16 miniature HEPA filter made of charcoal, and that  
17 vent plug was involved in this drum.

18                   We were actually loading the Army  
19 material on gondola cars, and there were three  
20 carts of materials of drums being taken over to  
21 load into the gondola car. The drum that exploded  
22 really was a deteriorated 55-gallon drum. Because  
23 it was deteriorated, it was overpacked into an  
24 85-gallon drum, which also had deteriorated and was

1 overpacked into a 110-gallon drum. The 110-gallon  
2 drum had a vent plug in it, and we have come to the  
3 conclusion that there was hydrogen generated in the  
4 drum, and that in the movement this particular  
5 metal, which we call spill metal, something that  
6 spills over when we were doing the casting  
7 operations, basically sparked and created the  
8 explosion.

9 We immediately stopped all drum  
10 movements on-site until we could convince ourselves  
11 that no more drums would be moved that had any  
12 hydrogen generation possibility at all.

13 Westinghouse appointed a task team to  
14 look at it, and basically Mr. Tiller appointed  
15 George Gartrell, whom he introduced, and myself to  
16 oversee that activity, and what we've done is on a  
17 case by case basis, depending on the situation of  
18 the materials, release those for further drum  
19 movement and handling on-site. Westinghouse came  
20 up with a plan, a plan of attack on how to look at  
21 all the drums, and George and I invited some  
22 experts, two from Sandia Laboratories and one from  
23 Oak Ridge National Laboratory, to basically come  
24 and oversee with us what Westinghouse's plan was

1 and to agree that yes we were doing the right  
2 thing. The Sandia National Laboratory, the person  
3 that came up from there basically was an expert in  
4 gas generation and transport, basically gas  
5 diffusion. The other expert that came with him was  
6 one of those who had helped develop the vent plug.  
7 The man from Oak Ridge had some 49, if you can  
8 imagine, 49 years of experience of handling  
9 uranium. So between the three of them and  
10 ourselves, we came to the conclusion that, yes, it  
11 looked like Westinghouse was doing the right  
12 thing.

13                   We did approve some drums for  
14 movement and handling. Basically Westinghouse went  
15 through, looked at all the materials and looked for  
16 those possible materials that might generate  
17 hydrogen. Right now they have come up with a plan  
18 to actually sniff for hydrogen any of the drums  
19 that we still have remaining. Once -- hydrogen in  
20 the air, basically if you have 4 percent hydrogen  
21 in a mixture of air, it can explode. So what  
22 Westinghouse has done is set that lower level and  
23 then reduced that by less than half and said if we  
24 have less hydrogen than this 50 percent of the 4

1 percent, then we can go ahead and move and handle  
2 the drums.

3                   So we've given them permission  
4 basically based on that, on their method for  
5 sniffing and on the caveat that it must be below  
6 the lower explosive limit and less than 50 percent  
7 of that, that they could go ahead and handle  
8 materials. We have not released drums that still  
9 have vent plugs in them, nor those that are  
10 sealed. We'll keep you further posted on the rest  
11 of that. Next slide, please.

12                   We have basically been trying to get  
13 rid of all materials on-site. We've finally gotten  
14 some progress through headquarters with  
15 Congressional approval and review to sell our mixed  
16 and normal materials. We had a general information  
17 meeting on May 25th, 1992. We had roughly 17  
18 people attend from 9 companies; 8 companies  
19 submitted a bid and expressed an expression of  
20 interest. The request for proposal now is in the  
21 draft review. It must be approved by headquarters  
22 and Congress, who is interested in flooding the  
23 market, the American market with uranium. We're  
24 looking for a projected final request for proposal



1 in the Fall of 1992. I believe the proposal will  
2 allow 60 days response from those interested  
3 parties.

4 The last slide is the depleted  
5 material. Basically we've gone through the same  
6 process. We have five expressions of interest.  
7 Request for proposal was issued June 29th. We  
8 expect the final RFP to be out on the street the  
9 Fall of this year. Thank you. Jack.

10 MR. CRAIG: Thank you, Ray. Before  
11 I get started, I would like to also introduce one  
12 other person here tonight. Dave Kozlowski is here  
13 from our DOE headquarters program office, and Dave  
14 has been very instrumental in helping the site with  
15 a number of activities, informing people at  
16 headquarters and getting things through  
17 headquarters that sometimes take a long time, but  
18 Dave spends a lot of time out at this site and is  
19 very critical in our success here.

20 I'm going to be going over the RI/FS  
21 update tonight and also some information on removal  
22 actions, similar to what I did at the last meeting  
23 but a little bit different. I'm going to go into  
24 detail on just a few of the removal actions.

1                   On your chairs you should have a  
2 handout that looks similar to this, although not  
3 colored, which gives you a general outline of the  
4 RI/FS milestone for reach of the operable units at  
5 the site, and I'll go over each one of the operable  
6 units and their current status of activities of  
7 each of them.

8                   For Operable Unit 1, which is  
9 essentially the waste pit area at the site on the  
10 northwest corner of the site, we have completed all  
11 characterization of the area, validation of the  
12 data has been completed. We are in the process of  
13 preparing the Remedial Investigation report.  
14 Treatability studies are ongoing as we speak here  
15 tonight. We are looking at solidification or  
16 cementation of the waste. We're also looking at  
17 vitrification, and we're also looking at a project  
18 to combine some of the waste produced by treatment  
19 in other operable units, mixing it with the  
20 Operable Unit 1 waste through a vitrification  
21 process to reduce total volume waste at the site.

22                   Operable Unit 2 includes the flyash  
23 piles, both active and inactive, the lime sludge  
24 ponds, and solid waste landfill. We have

1 completed, as in Operable Unit 1, all the  
2 characterization activities. That data is being  
3 assembled right now. We have been through one  
4 internal review of the Remedial Investigation  
5 report. This report is due to EPA and will be in  
6 the Administrative Record on October 19th of this  
7 year. It will be the first major RI/FS document  
8 which will be put, for the operable units since our  
9 Consent Agreement renegotiations last fall. We  
10 have completed treatability studies on the Operable  
11 Unit 2 waste. A treatability study report was  
12 issued to EPA on the 13th of this month. We are --  
13 we also looked at solidification, which worked very  
14 well on the Operable Unit 2 waste. This report is  
15 in the Administrative Record if you're interested  
16 in seeing it also.

17 Operable Unit 3 is the, essentially  
18 the production area. Major documents, one major  
19 document is in the Administrative Record right now,  
20 it was the work plan for the characterization of  
21 the buildings and other facilities in Operable Unit  
22 3. That document was submitted to EPA and put in  
23 the Administrative Record on May 29th of this  
24 year. We are reviewing that document with EPA

1 right time now and hopefully will finalize it  
2 within the next few months.

3 Operable Unit 4, we have completed  
4 all the characterization activities in this unit  
5 also. Validation of the data has been completed,  
6 and we are preparing the Remedial Investigation  
7 report, which is due to EPA in April of next year.  
8 Treatability studies, we are looking at  
9 solidification, cementation, and vitrification.  
10 Vitrification has worked well in some of our lab  
11 scale studies so far. We're also looking at a  
12 chemical separation treatability, which would try  
13 to separate the higher contaminants out of the K-65  
14 waste to reduce the volume that may require special  
15 attention.

16 Operable Unit 5, we are continuing  
17 with characterization activities, mostly soil  
18 sampling and groundwater monitoring. We do have  
19 some treatability studies which involve soil  
20 washing, which is a method to remove the  
21 contaminants out of any contaminated soils within  
22 Operable Unit 5. Operable Unit 5 includes all the  
23 media or things that were not included in Operable  
24 Units 1 through 4.

1                   You have a document coming out August  
2 5th called the site-wide characterization report,  
3 which is a document required by our Consent  
4 Agreement. It's basically broken into three  
5 parts. It includes a summary of the data, which we  
6 compiled as of December of last year when we  
7 started writing the report. It will also include a  
8 baseline risk assessment for the site, which is a  
9 preliminary look at a risk assessment for the site  
10 based on that data, and will also give a summary of  
11 what the leading remedial alternatives are for each  
12 of the operable units based on what we know today,  
13 relying a lot on the information which comes out of  
14 initial screening of alternatives reports which are  
15 either in preparation right now or have been  
16 approved. And once again this document will be  
17 available August 5th.

18                   For the removal actions there's also  
19 another handout on your chair which gives a listing  
20 of all 27 removal actions that are either ongoing  
21 or planned at the site. I'm going the talk about 6  
22 of these in-depth tonight. I have three slides.  
23 Essentially off of this slide I'm going to be  
24 talking about the waste pit runoff control, the

1 South Plume, Silos 1 and 2, and the Plant 1 pad.  
2 Off this slide I'm going to talk about the active  
3 flyash pile controls and the Plant 1 ore silos.  
4 That's just the rest of them that are on that  
5 sheet.

6           The waste pit runoff control removal  
7 action was a removal action which I guess started  
8 up about two years ago with the writing of an EE/CA  
9 document which went out for public review. We had  
10 a few community meetings on it. Construction on  
11 this activity has been ongoing for about a year  
12 now, and it was completed in June of last -- June  
13 30th of, I guess last month. The scheduled  
14 completion date was July 30th, so it was completed  
15 about a month ahead of schedule. The purpose of  
16 this removal action was to eliminate all runoff  
17 from the waste pit area or Operable Unit 1 into  
18 Paddy's Run. I have a couple, or one picture of it  
19 anyway. The runoff will be collected in a sump,  
20 which this is a picture of it under construction  
21 here. All runoff will be collected in this sump  
22 and treated through the existing plant effluent  
23 treatment system before it's discharged to the  
24 river, thereby eliminating its discharge to Paddy's

1 Run.

2 Removal action 4, I talked a little  
3 bit about at the last meeting. It was the removal  
4 action to reduce radon emissions from the K-65  
5 silos. We did announce at the last meeting that it  
6 had been completed, which was done ahead of  
7 schedule, on November 28th. Based on some of the  
8 monitoring results we've taken over the last six  
9 months, we've noticed a significant reduction of  
10 both radon emissions and radiation as a result of  
11 the placement of the bentonite clay in the silos.

12 The two bullets here talk about radon  
13 concentrations in the silo headspace reduced by 95  
14 percent. Based on the latest results of samples  
15 that were taken the last week, we've seen  
16 concentrations down by 99 percent. So it's been  
17 very effective in reducing radon. The radiation  
18 reduction, I have a couple of slides on that just  
19 to give you an idea of reduction in the -- This is  
20 a radiation readings directly on the silo domes.  
21 As you can tell, prior to bentonite placement we  
22 had readings anywhere from about 150 millirem per  
23 hour up to 200 millirem per hour, and I think we're  
24 averaging about 5 millirem per hour now after

1 bentonite placement. That's Silo 1 and that's  
2 similar for Silo 2, which there's another slide.

3 This is the piece of equipment that  
4 was used to suspend above the silos to place the  
5 bentonite, and I think we showed a video of that  
6 operation at the last meeting.

7 The next topic is the South Plume  
8 removal action. Since the last meeting, we have  
9 initiated construction on two parts of, actually  
10 two parts of this removal action. Part one was  
11 ongoing at the last meeting. Part one is a project  
12 to provide alternate water to one of the industries  
13 south of the site. We started construction this  
14 spring. We have completed all the construction on  
15 which we have access to the property. We're going  
16 through a process right now to obtain access to the  
17 remainder of the properties. We plan to have all  
18 construction completed and operational by December  
19 7th of this year.

20 Part two is a treatment system to  
21 treat some contaminated water on-site to insure  
22 that we don't increase uranium discharge to the  
23 river by pumping the South Plume back to the site.  
24 This involves the construction of three small scale



1 pilot treatment systems. Those are essentially  
2 completed. They're going through start-up of those  
3 systems right now, and they will be operational by  
4 the 30th of this month.

5 Part three is the portion of this  
6 project to remove the contaminated groundwater from  
7 the South Plume area and pump it back to the site.  
8 We have started construction within the last month  
9 and a half on this activity. We are proceeding  
10 with all construction where we do have access to  
11 the properties. We have one or two properties  
12 which we are also going to have to go through a  
13 process to obtain access. Nevertheless, we feel  
14 construction will be completed and that system will  
15 be operational by January of next year.

16 Part five, I'll just mention we have  
17 initiated and almost completed some, what we call  
18 hydropunching or groundwater sampling in the area  
19 south of the South Plume to better define where the  
20 boundary of this, the lower boundary of this plume  
21 is and also to look at any commingling possibly  
22 with other contaminants down at the industries  
23 south of the South Plume. We did do the sampling,  
24 we started a sampling the end of June, and it

1 should be completed this week. We did split sample  
2 those wells with the industries down there so they  
3 would have the same information we have to help in  
4 their cleanup.

5 This is the picture showing the  
6 construction or the excavation for part one of  
7 installation of the pipeline.

8 Ray mentioned waste shipments  
9 tonight. Plant 1 pad at the site is where a lot of  
10 the drummed waste, existing drummed waste at the  
11 site is located right now. We have a very large  
12 project to renovate that pad for both storage we  
13 need today and future storage at the site. The  
14 project has been broken down into three phases.  
15 Phase one was to provide some runoff controls on  
16 the pad, which was completed in January ahead of  
17 schedule. Phase two is to construct some  
18 additional covered storage on the pad, and just a  
19 couple of pictures here I can show you. This is  
20 what the pad looked like back in 1986, and you can  
21 see the significant number of drums, many of them  
22 without aisles so they couldn't be inspected. A  
23 number of -- not very well segregated, and you can  
24 see a lot of them are rusted and they were out in

1 the weather.

2                   This picture was taken earlier this  
3 spring, and you can see in the middle of the  
4 picture there are two sprung structured covered  
5 storage facilities. Part two of this removal  
6 action will also construct an additional 80,000  
7 square feet of covered storage which will be off to  
8 the west of the pad, which is on the right side of  
9 that picture, and you'll see two more covered  
10 storage locations similar to those that are on the  
11 picture there. We're also doing some upgrades to  
12 the shipping dock which are not evident in this  
13 picture to help us with our waste shipments.

14                   The active flyash pile was another  
15 removal action that was planned during our Consent  
16 Agreement negotiations and was -- we really had a  
17 lengthier time for implementation than we actually  
18 encountered. We completed the removal action at  
19 the end of last month, and we were able to cut out  
20 a lot of time in the schedule by deleting a lot of  
21 the design time on this removal action. I think  
22 the original schedule had about a year longer than  
23 this, but it was completed ahead of schedule. It  
24 was removal action to provide for wind and water

1 erosion controls to the active flyash pile, which  
2 had historically, members of the community and  
3 other people at the site had noticed that the  
4 flyash would blow and erode during high wind and  
5 water and rain events.

6 I have a before and after picture  
7 here. This was a picture of the pile prior to us  
8 doing anything out there, and you can see the  
9 flyash, the trucks putting the flyash in the pile  
10 would deliver and just dump it on top of the pile,  
11 and there was really no control of where it went or  
12 no compacting of the material. What we did in the  
13 removal action was we upgraded the pile by  
14 compacting almost the entire top of the pile and  
15 restricting any future use of the pile to this  
16 center area, which you can see the small deposited  
17 material. We also put a wind fence around the  
18 entire perimeter of the top of the pile. We  
19 sprayed an epoxy coating crusting agent on the side  
20 slopes of the pile to make sure that water erosion  
21 would be controlled, and also, you can't see it  
22 very well in this picture, but there is a silt  
23 fence on the right side of the picture. There is a  
24 black outer fence that goes around the toe of the

1 flyash pile to make sure any water erosion doesn't  
2 escape the area. Once again, very significant  
3 effort by a lot of people within our office and  
4 Westinghouse in getting that completed ahead of  
5 schedule.

6           The Plant 1 ore silos is a removal  
7 action that's kind of one of the first big D&D  
8 projects at the site. I don't know if you noticed,  
9 there's a scale model back in the back which shows  
10 the Plant 1 ore silos, and since it was the first  
11 D&D project, hopefully this model will provide some  
12 benefits and cost savings that we had seen in some  
13 of the other models we produced at the site as far  
14 as design changes and construction changes. We  
15 have got this removal action approved, the work  
16 plans approved by US and Ohio EPA. We are planning  
17 to start construction by awarding a contract for  
18 this project in August, and hopefully complete it  
19 by 1994. Like I said, this is the first of many  
20 large D&D projects at the site, and we're anxious  
21 to get started on it. There's a picture of it  
22 right here, and if you're interested, there's also  
23 a model in the back of the room.

24           Something we may have talked about at

1 the last meeting, I'm not sure I remember, but DOE  
2 has agreed to do a settlement, and part of our  
3 negotiations last year with US EPA agreed to do a  
4 supplemental environment project to benefit the  
5 community. The amount would be \$150,000. We have,  
6 we took input from the community about suggestions  
7 of what you would like to see done, and after  
8 discussions with US EPA, decided on two things,  
9 first a cleanup of the Great Miami River and also  
10 a, provide some additional funding to an ongoing  
11 wellhead protection program, which is a program in  
12 the local area to do an inventory of hazardous  
13 chemicals by different industries to protect the  
14 groundwater supply.

15 We are planning -- we have talked to  
16 the Miami Conservancy District out of Dayton, which  
17 has conducted these river cleanups in the past.  
18 They are planning to do one this September, which  
19 we will take part in. We will be providing them  
20 \$150,000 through a grant, which will fund both the  
21 river cleanup and the wellhead protection program.  
22 Like I said, in September we are planning on  
23 cleaning up the river.

24 I guess that's all on the slides.

1 One thing I would like to mention, we are planning,  
2 we had some questions I believe at the last meeting  
3 on what we're looking at for on-site, possible  
4 on-site disposal of waste through our remediation.  
5 We mentioned the engineered waste management  
6 facility, and people had some questions on what  
7 that facility is and what the plans were and how  
8 much work we'd done on it. We have agreed through  
9 some discussions with people in the community to  
10 hold a community roundtable specifically on this  
11 topic. That will be held on August 10th, next  
12 month. There is a sign-up sheet, I believe it's in  
13 the back, I haven't seen it here tonight. I'm  
14 sorry, it's over at the front desk here if you're  
15 interested in sitting in on it. And we will give  
16 you an overview of what we're looking at as far as  
17 possible on-site storage and/or disposal  
18 alternatives for the operable units. So it should  
19 be interesting.

20 That's all I have as far as  
21 presentation. There's many more details on the  
22 exhibits in the back if you're, if you haven't seen  
23 them already. Myself or our staff will be  
24 available to answer any questions when we're done,

1 and thank you.

2 MR. TILLER: Thanks, Jack. Just  
3 further protocol, I would like to take a short  
4 break. I see a yawn or two out there, you probably  
5 need a stretch. I'm afraid most of the yawns are  
6 on the part of DOE or its contractors, however, so  
7 they'll take a little stretch.

8 After the break, Jim Saric of the US  
9 EPA and Graham Mitchell of Ohio EPA will have a few  
10 comments, and then FRESH comments, I assume, will  
11 be provided by Lisa, and then we'll go into any of  
12 the questions you want to throw at us. Thank you.

13 (Brief recess.)

14 MR. TILLER: Good evening again. I  
15 see that most of you managed to get a little  
16 refreshment and are starting to take your seats, so  
17 I wonder if the rest of us could do it.

18 This is the last call for taking your  
19 seats. Anyone here that are part of the public,  
20 the community, can mill around all they want. The  
21 contractors and the DOE people will either be  
22 excused or sit down.

23 As has been the custom, the last two  
24 of these I've attended, Jim Saric from the US EPA



3638

1 will give you some of his views first.

2 MR. SARIC: I have been involved in  
3 this project now for about a year, a little over a  
4 year, and it's kind of interesting to see that  
5 things are really starting to move finally. I  
6 think when I first got involved here, it was quite  
7 a task to look at all the work that was up front  
8 and try to negotiate these schedules and try to get  
9 things moving, and I feel pretty positive right now  
10 about what things have happened. If you look at  
11 the removal actions, we have 27 removal actions  
12 that are ongoing or planned now. Come spring or  
13 January of next year, I'm sure we're going to have  
14 some more removal actions planned that will be  
15 going on and this thing will just keep moving. I'm  
16 sure slowly but surely we're going to show some  
17 progress. I think that's real important. At EPA  
18 we're very concerned about getting this place  
19 cleaned up in a very efficient manner and to keep  
20 things moving. It's very important.

21 There's some major documents that I  
22 think everybody should be aware of. The site-wide  
23 characterization report is going to look at some,  
24 based on risk assessment information, it's going to

3638

1 provide some of the leading remedial alternatives  
2 or leading candidates on what they're going to plan  
3 on doing with this site. They may not necessarily  
4 be the actual event or the actual cleanup remedy,  
5 but it is going to be part of this decision-making  
6 process. I know when we amended the agreement, we  
7 sat down, we had a public meeting, we went over the  
8 process or the logic behind this project, and this  
9 site-wide characterization report is pretty  
10 important in seeing where the facility is going and  
11 where we may be going with some of this project.  
12 So I think it's important if you get a chance to  
13 take a look at this report.

14 The OU-2 RI report, remedial  
15 investigation report is the first remedial  
16 investigation report we're going to get. It's  
17 going to show the extent of contamination for OU-2,  
18 and again, I think it is very important because  
19 it's going to show that we've been moving, that DOE  
20 has been doing some activities off-site and moving  
21 forward towards selecting a remedy and getting some  
22 remedial activities going on in OU-2.

23 We've been looking at the OU-3 work  
24 plan. It's a plan how we're going to look at the

Spangler Reporting Services

(513) 381-3330

1 production area. You've got a lot of buildings  
2 there, it's a very unique work plan, and we've had  
3 a lot of extensive revisions. I think we're going  
4 to have to go through with this work plan, but we  
5 met for quite a long time today and we met last  
6 week and talked on this to try to figure a way to  
7 work this out, how we're going to move some of  
8 these buildings and get them down and  
9 decontaminated and such.

10 Overall, we've had some problems in  
11 doing things with some of the work plans. We've  
12 had to send a lot of comments, but we've worked  
13 through things with DOE. It hasn't been easy, but  
14 we're going to continue to work cooperatively  
15 hopefully to keep moving, and that's real  
16 important, to keep things going as much as we can.

17 Finally, I guess the last thing I  
18 want to talk about is the ERM, and just to stress  
19 that I know when a new ERM is selected, the EPA,  
20 I'm going to be very open to meet with the ERM and  
21 DOE and meet with the citizens to make sure the  
22 transition is as smooth as possible. Again, we  
23 don't want to see any delays in the new contractor  
24 being selected or anything there, but we want to

1 make sure that we're involved in helping that  
2 transition as much as possible.

3 If anyone has any questions, feel  
4 free to talk to me afterwards when we get a break  
5 and I'll be glad to answer any questions you've  
6 got. Thanks.

7 MR. TILLER: Thanks, Jim. I  
8 appreciate the comments and, believe me, there are  
9 many of us that are not just worried but trying to  
10 work very hard to make the ERM transition go  
11 smoothly, and it is a very complicated process to  
12 change contractors like that.

13 Next, Graham, did you want to say  
14 something? This is Graham Mitchell from the Ohio  
15 EPA.

16 MR. MITCHELL: Good evening. As  
17 Jack Craig has pointed out and Jim Saric also, I  
18 think there's a lot of progress occurring at the  
19 site right now. I would encourage you to look,  
20 especially those of you who have been frustrated by  
21 schedule delays and when you look at the ROD dates,  
22 they're pretty far down the road, but I would  
23 encourage you to take a look at the removal actions  
24 as Jack Craig described tonight. There's a

1 significant amount of effort occurring, and I am  
2 really beginning to think that through all these  
3 removal actions we're really beginning to get at  
4 and reduce some of the risks from the site both  
5 on-site and off-site. I think we're really  
6 beginning to make progress in that area, and that's  
7 something that is really important, and DOE and  
8 Westinghouse deserve some credit for that and a lot  
9 of credit for that.

10 In the past several months, like Jim  
11 said, we also have expressed some concerns about  
12 the ERM contract and the transition period into  
13 that. We're real concerned that in the confusion  
14 in breaking a new contractor in that there could be  
15 schedule delays, and I just want to say tonight, as  
16 Jim did, that Ohio EPA will pretty much make itself  
17 available to DOE, the contractors, and to sit in  
18 and pretty much just get involved in this process  
19 and do anything that we can to help with the  
20 transition in any way possible.

21 We are here tonight as usual to  
22 answer your questions and hear your concerns, and  
23 I'll be glad to help answer those. With me also  
24 tonight is Tom Schneider with Ohio EPA, Curt

1 Koehler is also new with Ohio EPA, and from our  
2 Public Interest Center, Jane Taft. We'll all be  
3 available to answer any questions during the  
4 session. Thank you very much.

5 MR. TILLER: Thanks, Graham. We  
6 extend a welcome to your cohorts that are here.

7 Last on the agenda part before Q's  
8 and A's is the FRESH comments, and Lisa will  
9 deliver those on behalf of FRESH I can tell.

10 MS. CRAWFORD: We're always last,  
11 you know. We should get to be first actually. I  
12 don't have a whole lot to say tonight, but a  
13 couple, I want to reiterate a couple of things that  
14 Ohio and US EPA both said. But the first thing I  
15 want to talk a little bit about tonight is the  
16 public water system, and I think we're as  
17 frustrated as you are with the Hamilton County  
18 Commissioners and their most recent report of \$9.2  
19 million. We're going to take a little contingency  
20 of our folks down to the Hamilton County  
21 Commissioners meeting in a few weeks and hopefully  
22 we can figure this whole thing out. I just want to  
23 stress we need this water project to move and move  
24 rapidly and make sure things get done in a timely

1 manner instead of just laying on somebody's desk or  
2 throwing it around, a 4.1 or 9.2 and all these  
3 little figures. If there's a way that we can be  
4 helpful in aiding you in getting this somehow moved  
5 more quickly than it's been moving in the last few  
6 weeks, we're more than willing to do that, but we  
7 will be making a visit to the Hamilton County  
8 Commissioners office here very soon.

9           The other thing, I think FRESH is,  
10 again like Jim and Graham both said, is a little  
11 bit concerned about the new ERMC folks coming on  
12 board. One of the things I want to say is the  
13 minute the new contractor is named, I certainly  
14 want to be called and told who they are and I want  
15 a meeting to be set up with them immediately. I  
16 want to make FRESH as available to meet with them,  
17 and we want them to know that we're willing to do  
18 that and we want an open relationship with them,  
19 with the new contractor. We want to begin to talk  
20 with them and meet with them right away to kind of  
21 let them know where we stand and to also let them  
22 know we will try to assist them in any way that we  
23 can. My hope is that the new contractor will be  
24 proactive instead of reactive. I want them to come

1 in here, I want them to work with Westinghouse, I  
2 want this transition to be extremely smooth. I  
3 don't want this bickering and fighting and stuff as  
4 we saw when NLO and Westinghouse phased in with one  
5 another. There was some bickering and arguing and  
6 turf wars and things like that, and I think that's  
7 a big waste of time and I don't think we should  
8 have to go through that again this time. It is  
9 going to be extremely hard on everybody. We want  
10 to make sure that the new contractor knows that  
11 Ohio EPA and US EPA and FRESH are committed to this  
12 project and that we are willing to work with them.

13           The other thing is once this  
14 contractor comes on board, we want to make sure  
15 that the roundtables continue, the environmental  
16 course in the fall proceeds as planned, that the  
17 openness in the RI/FS process proceeds, and that we  
18 also get the follow-up information on the  
19 above-ground storage facilities. We want our  
20 24-hour notification to proceed as it has been  
21 working pretty well lately. We want that to  
22 continue, and we want the reading room to remain as  
23 is and to be open and everything like it is now.  
24 We want to be asked for input before things are



1 done instead of after the decisions have been made  
2 and done. All we're asking for is to be kept  
3 notified and to know what's going on and to somehow  
4 be helpful if at all possible.

5 Now, since I've told you all my  
6 demands, I'll pat you on the back for a little  
7 bit. I think Graham and Jim basically said it all,  
8 things are moving along, trucks are leaving,  
9 barrels are being moved. God, I hate to wish  
10 things on Nevada, but they can't stay here, we know  
11 that, this is not the place for them. We're  
12 pleased that we're seeing movement, we're seeing  
13 some things done, we're seeing some things met, and  
14 basically we're seeing some work get done. Still  
15 kind of slow, but we're bearing with you all.

16 The other thing, the last thing I'll  
17 mention is I don't want you to miss any deadlines,  
18 and with this transition, with the new contractor,  
19 I'm real afraid that's going to happen, and we want  
20 to stay right on track with those deadlines in that  
21 Consent Agreement because you're going to find  
22 yourself in a world of trouble when you miss them,  
23 and I think that is going to have to be beat into  
24 the new contractor's head, and let's just hope that

1 they're a good contractor. Thank you.

2 MR. TILLER: You didn't ask those in  
3 the way of questions, but I'll mention a few of  
4 them. One of those things that you were interested  
5 in continuing, I can commit now, they will all  
6 continue, whoever the ERMIC is. Really, the ERMIC  
7 does work for the Department of Energy, and we can  
8 influence them. Jerry just pointed out we're  
9 thinking of having the ERMIC at a roundtable in  
10 September that's scheduled to start getting  
11 familiar. In terms of missing milestones, you  
12 know, if I forget my wife's birthday, I'm afraid  
13 I'm going to get a NOV anymore, or worse. We are  
14 very interested.

15 MS. CRAWFORD: I can think of a  
16 better acronym.

17 MR. TILLER: We are extremely  
18 interested in making the milestones. This project,  
19 I'll philosophize with you for just a minute, I've  
20 been involved in projects where you wanted to build  
21 a reactor or you wanted to get an old reactor  
22 restarted or you wanted to get a reactor running,  
23 and you had a whole group of people that were able  
24 to focus on a goal so that they could all share the

1 vision. This project has a number of parallel  
2 things, the removal actions, the various OU's, and  
3 they don't really come together in a visible  
4 fashion. We have literally hundreds of milestones  
5 to meet, and we are working very hard to meet  
6 those, but, and I don't want to say we're going to  
7 miss any, and we're not going to quit trying, but  
8 when we have problems that are unanticipated, such  
9 as access, and we hadn't gone through that process  
10 before and it involves a number of agencies, it is  
11 not always easy, believe me, and when you deal with  
12 county commissioners -- and, by the way, the public  
13 water thing, I was new here 9 or 10 months ago, and  
14 I thought, my goodness, you have a DOE organization  
15 to deal with, you've got commissioners to deal  
16 with, you've got shared costs, it may seem awfully  
17 slow to you, but I think it's moving relatively  
18 rapidly and the paper is not sitting in our  
19 offices. We're moving that.

20 MS. CRAWFORD: I'm not saying  
21 that --

22 MR. TILLER: But the more  
23 organizations you have to deal with, the more  
24 complex it becomes, it's just a fact of life.

1 I think we ought to open it to  
2 questions if we have questions.

3 MR. WESTERBECK: Excuse me, Bob,  
4 could I make a comment to follow-up on the public  
5 water while it's fresh in our minds. While they  
6 are reviewing our EE/CA document or having their  
7 consultant do that, we are working, Carlos is  
8 working with the Department of Public Works on the  
9 actual process for granting them the money. In  
10 other words, they have to submit a paper to us and  
11 we have to turn the application around, so that is  
12 happening, so there's not really any lost time  
13 while their consultant looks at the report.

14 MR. TILLER: Questions? Do we have  
15 a question? Now, unlike last time, where some of  
16 us managers up at the front trouble tried to fumble  
17 through answers, I used to know a guy who said,  
18 boy, I wish I could get into management so I didn't  
19 have to know anything. Well, we're in management  
20 now, so we've got the people who know something  
21 sitting here ready to get up and grab the mike to  
22 help us.

23 MR. CONLIFF: I'm Steve Conliff, I'm  
24 a National Writer's Union member, I guess maybe

1 this is for Ray. This is the first that I've heard  
2 of material and moving out by rail. My  
3 understanding was in Cincinnati that it was all  
4 moving out in Sealand trucks. Could you maybe give  
5 me some more information on how you run stuff out  
6 by rail, when this started?

7 MR. HANSEN: Actually we had the  
8 first shipment, if I remember the exact date, I  
9 think it was June 10th. Is that the first shipment  
10 that went out?

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

12 MR. TILLER: It was June 10th. We  
13 actually shipped two gondola cars to Smith Snelling  
14 in South Carolina. We've been working with the  
15 Army on that. They preferred shipment by rail, it  
16 is cheaper. The prices for burial at Barnwell,  
17 South Carolina are very high, so they're looking at  
18 bulk type shipments rather than truck shipments and  
19 drum container shipments. But you mentioned  
20 sealand containers by truck, we also ship drums by  
21 truck and sealand containers. Yes, it is new for  
22 us, but I think we did, even if we only did it the  
23 day before we intended to make the first shipment,  
24 we did inform Morgan Trustee or Township Trustees.

1 MR. CONLIFF: Now, does this go --  
2 is this CSX?

3 MR. HANSEN: Yes.

4 MR. CONLIFF: Do you deal with them  
5 separately from Sealand or is it all --

6 MR. HANSEN: Pardon?

7 MR. CONLIFF: Do you deal with them  
8 separately from Sealand or does it all go through  
9 CSX? Sealand is a subsidiary of CSX.

10 MR. HANSEN: No, when we say  
11 sealand, we mean the container itself. We do not  
12 ship through Sealand, it's only the container.  
13 That's the container they use to ship across the  
14 seas, and basically it's something that's been put  
15 on the flatbed of a truck.

16 MR. CONLIFF: Those don't come from  
17 Sealand Corporation?

18 MR. HANSEN: We purchase those used  
19 from other users, other containers. Those are all  
20 used containers that we purchase.

21 MR. CONLIFF: I want to make sure I  
22 understand then. The stuff that you move out by  
23 truck, you actually, you being the DOE, is actually  
24 moved out in your own vehicles?

3638

1 MR. HANSEN: No.

2 MR. CONLIFF: I'm confused then.

3 MR. HANSEN: We have a carrier that  
4 we have contracted with that basically takes our  
5 shipments by their trucks to Nevada test site.

6 MR. CONLIFF: Who is that carrier,  
7 please?

8 MR. HANSEN: The name of the  
9 carrier?

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Ranger.

11 MR. HANSEN: Ranger.

12 MR. CONLIFF: But you don't have any  
13 contractual dealings at all with Sealand?

14 MR. HANSEN: No, we do not.

15 MR. CONLIFF: So far you've just  
16 moved a couple of gondola cars by rail but you are  
17 anticipating moving more that way?

18 MR. HANSEN: Yes, we intend to ship  
19 about 53, or we had. Now we don't know whether  
20 it's going to go by rail to Snelling in South  
21 Carolina or to the Nevada test site by truck. That  
22 will be the Army's decision.

23 MR. TILLER: Wally, he's fidgeting,  
24 he wants to say something, get up to the mike.

1 You've got to stand up and let them see you.

2 MR. QUAIDER: I may be able to  
3 help. I think part of this confusion, we don't,  
4 no, we haven't in the recent past shipped anything  
5 until just now by rail. Our typical waste  
6 shipments go by truck, which we have a carrier we  
7 hire, which is Ranger, we put the large boxes on  
8 which are called sealand containers, and that's a  
9 generic term for the boxes. Those all go by truck  
10 to Nevada test site because we don't have anywhere  
11 else right now we can ship our waste, and the  
12 reason they go by truck to the Nevada test site is  
13 that Nevada doesn't have a rail spurt.

14 MR. CONLIFF: But can you tell me  
15 who you do buy the sealand cargo containers from?

16 MR. QUAIDER: Actually they're for  
17 open bid. We've had a hard time getting enough of  
18 them. We can get back to you on the names of the  
19 companies we buy them from. It's just a series of  
20 them.

21 MR. TILLER: Thank you. Next  
22 question, please.

23 MS. MORGAN: Yes, my question is  
24 about the shipment to Nevada. How do you verify



1 the arrivals and the acceptance of the waste  
2 material in Nevada? Has that been verified by the  
3 news media? How can I know that it is there  
4 instead of dumped someplace in the river?

5 MR. HANSEN: Do you want to take  
6 that one, Dennis?

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: All of our  
8 shipments out to Nevada are shipped on a manifest  
9 system. When Nevada receives a shipment, they have  
10 to send a piece of paper back to us telling us that  
11 they received it. Our drivers are in contact with  
12 us as they move down the road, where they are and  
13 what their destination is. We also have a schedule  
14 when each driver is scheduled to arrive at Nevada.  
15 If they deviate from that schedule, we have to make  
16 corrections.

17 MS. MORGAN: Where is that  
18 information; is that available?

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's in our,  
20 part of that is in our waste shipment application  
21 to Nevada, it should be in the public reading  
22 room. I'll check to make sure it is. A lot of it  
23 is in the site procedures.

24 MR. QUAIDER: Tell her a little bit

1 about the schedules and when the trucks leave the  
2 DOE site.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right. If we  
4 have a truck that's on the road, they check in  
5 every day.

6 MS. MORGAN: But I don't know that.

7 MR. QUAIDER: What we could do is  
8 have a separate thing with our schedules.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, we can  
10 have something on schedules or something.

11 MR. QUAIDER: Maybe I can help a  
12 little. Because Nevada is a DOE site -- we're a  
13 DOE site.

14 MS. MORGAN: I don't know that. I  
15 mean, you know.

16 MR. QUAIDER: The Nevada test site  
17 is a DOE facility.

18 MS. MORGAN: All right.

19 MR. QUAIDER: And we have to dispose  
20 of right now our waste at another DOE facility.  
21 It's not open to just the general public, so to  
22 speak. What we're -- it's like on a daily working  
23 basis with Nevada, it's not like I'm going to Chem  
24 Waste Management or something like that with a load

1 of low level waste. For us to provide you with a,  
2 it's a daily schedule routine that we're working  
3 with Nevada on in faxes and things, we can provide  
4 schedules, give you truck numbers and things like  
5 that. Verifications for us are done by fax. We  
6 know when the truck has arrived and when the load  
7 goes in the ground on a working basis with the  
8 other DOE site.

9 MS. MORGAN: Okay. What I think I'm  
10 saying to avoid this or not waste so much time is I  
11 would like it somehow documented in the news media,  
12 at a meeting to show maybe even arrival, document  
13 the thing what you see, what is open for DOE or the  
14 Fernald or whoever is taking care of the waste now.

15 MR. QUAIDER: What we can do is ask  
16 for our next meeting, I would recommend that we add  
17 to our waste shipment process something specific on  
18 that.

19 MR. TILLER: If that's of interest  
20 to the general public, we would be glad to do it.  
21 Otherwise, those documents are not classified and  
22 if you specifically request them, we can make them  
23 available to you.

24 MS. MORGAN: I'd also like to, maybe

1 pictures, maybe reporters or someone that follows  
2 the trucks maybe.

3 MR. HANSEN: Let we suggest  
4 something. When we shipped our first load of  
5 thorium, there was media present at the Nevada test  
6 site and they did take pictures. Perhaps we could  
7 get you some of that press material and get that to  
8 you.

9 MS. MORGAN: All right.

10 MR. TILLER: And the media was here  
11 and did a news story on the thorium leaving the  
12 site.

13 MS. MORGAN: And we can be sure it  
14 was the same waste?

15 MR. TILLER: You may be absolutely  
16 certain without any doubt that it was the same  
17 waste.

18 MS. MORGAN: Yes, if it's  
19 documented.

20 MR. TILLER: It is documented.

21 MS. MORGAN: Because I don't really  
22 know if I believe --

23 MR. TILLER: These shipments all  
24 have to meet Department of Transportation

1 regulations, which call for a bill of lading that  
2 describes the contents of the shipment. All of  
3 these meet Department of Transportation  
4 regulations, both the shipping papers and the  
5 containers.

6 MS. MORGAN: All right. Then we can  
7 see them?

8 MR. TILLER: Yes, you may.

9 MS. MORGAN: Maybe a sample of that  
10 first run?

11 MR. TILLER: Sure.

12 MS. MORGAN: Fine. Are there  
13 minutes to this meeting?

14 MR. TILLER: Beg your pardon.

15 MS. MORGAN: Are there minutes;  
16 will you remember that?

17 MR. TILLER: Of this meeting?

18 MS. MORGAN: Yes.

19 MR. TILLER: It's being transcribed.

20 MS. MORGAN: All right, thank you.

21 MR. TILLER: Would you give your  
22 name, please?

23 MS. MORGAN: Lucy Morgan.

24 MR. TILLER: Thank you. Are there

1 any other questions?

2 MS. YOCUM: The first thing I want  
3 to talk about is the public water system. DOE,  
4 with the money situation, DOE has two options, and  
5 their names are Ruetgers-Nease and Albright &  
6 Wilson, that they have contaminated the area also,  
7 and part of it is in the South Plume, and they  
8 should be responsible for their part of  
9 contaminating the area's water, drinking water. So  
10 I think that if there's any money problems or money  
11 situations, they should pick up on the rest of it.

12 MS. CRAWFORD: They can kick in  
13 their fair share just like you guys did.

14 MR. TILLER: I'm going to invite our  
15 regulators to speak on this issue, as well as  
16 Carlos, who is our South Plume expert if he wants  
17 to add any clarification on that. Carlos, in  
18 particular the mixed contamination.

19 MR. FERMAINTT: As far as you'll  
20 remember, back when we relocated the well field to  
21 this new location, we have proposed to EPA to do  
22 this part five of South Plume removal action, which  
23 is going to do some hydropunching activity,  
24 something of the South Plume area to identify or

1 delineate the area of the South Plume, delineate  
2 contaminants and the Paddy's Run Road site  
3 contaminants. To request the Paddy's Run Road site  
4 to provide funding to this part of the water  
5 supply, again that should be a role that the  
6 regulator will have to take place. I don't see  
7 that DOE can request them to put a share in this  
8 project. What we could do, what we can do  
9 otherwise is making sure that this project will  
10 move on, making sure that we work closely with the  
11 County Commissioners and the Public Water Director,  
12 making sure that we work all together in trying to  
13 get this project to move on. That's all I can say.

14 MS. YOCUM: So as far as the  
15 regulators, is that EPA, that they're the ones that  
16 have to help?

17 MR. FERMAINTT: I will let -- Graham  
18 will have to speak on that.

19 MS. YOCUM: Graham then.

20 MR. MITCHELL: From a practical  
21 standpoint, Edwa, I think you're right. I think  
22 there has been damage to the aquifer, and I think  
23 you make a good point. From a practical  
24 standpoint, if we want a public water supply, I

1 think we better let it go the way it's going right  
2 now or the system will become so bogged down  
3 between lawyers and three other corporations thrown  
4 in the middle of this that there will never be a  
5 public water supply, or at least it will be five to  
6 ten years away if we fool with this right now. I'm  
7 being very frank at this point.

8 MS. YOCUM: This is again the way  
9 the politics work or something if you want to call  
10 it that as far as another three companies get out  
11 of being responsible of using people as guinea pigs  
12 or destroying their health and they're getting away  
13 with it. They have to pay.

14 MR. MITCHELL: I wouldn't say  
15 they're getting away with it. I think if we get  
16 the system in the ground now, there are other ways  
17 of recovering costs at a later date. I can't say  
18 that that will actually happen, but I think if we  
19 want a system in the ground now, we'll let the  
20 system roll as it's rolling right now. That would  
21 be my recommendation. It's not right, it's not  
22 wrong, it's just what will work.

23 MS. NUNGESTER: You will agree that  
24 you will go after them after it's in the ground and



1 that you will see that they pay share their share?

2 MR. MITCHELL: I can't give you  
3 assurances as to how that is all going to work  
4 out. It's not my site, to be honest with you.  
5 We'll need to work through that through other  
6 meetings.

7 MS. YOCUM: At the Paddy's Run site?

8 MR. MITCHELL: Right.

9 MR. TILLER: Let me add in terms of  
10 determining our fair share of the public water, we  
11 looked at the contamination we believe originated  
12 on our site, uranium, and we use that as the basis  
13 of determining our fair share. We did not look at  
14 other contaminants from other places to broaden our  
15 contribution.

16 MR. FERMAINTT: I would like to say  
17 something from the practical standpoint. As you  
18 all know, the contaminants of the Paddy's Run Road  
19 site are located more or less in the same area of  
20 uranium and potential pathway of the uranium  
21 contamination plume, contaminated plume. So for  
22 practical standpoint, all the people being affected  
23 by this uranium contaminated plume pathway, those  
24 are the same people that are being affected by the

1 Paddy's Run Road site. So all those people that  
2 have been affected or potentially be affected,  
3 those are going to be the ones that have a public  
4 water supply available for them.

5 MS. YOCUM: Thank you. Another  
6 one. This is to the EPA. What has happened to the  
7 \$150,000 Consent Agreement fine money while there  
8 has been no decision on exactly what it is going to  
9 be used for, what is it doing, collecting  
10 interest?

11 MR. SARIC: The money for the  
12 supplemental environmental project you're talking  
13 about, the 150,000 for that?

14 MS. YOCUM: Yeah.

15 MR. SARIC: That money, the  
16 Department of Energy had to get from their budget  
17 first of all from Congress, get that money budgeted  
18 from Congress.

19 MS. YOCUM: It was fine money.

20 MR. SARIC: Right. It basically  
21 goes into the Superfund, the penalty amount goes  
22 into the Superfund amount, the \$100,000 for that.  
23 The \$150,000 for the supplemental project goes from  
24 their budget from Congress, will go directly from

1 there into the supplemental project, which will  
2 probably be a grant to the Miami Conservancy  
3 District for the wellhead protection program and  
4 for the Great Miami River cleanup.

5 MS. YOCUM: I would like to make a  
6 comment on the Great Miami cleanup. That would be  
7 a complete waste of money because you have several  
8 other companies, even DOE companies like the Mound  
9 coming down into the Great Miami River, and I mean  
10 if you don't clean up their water up there, how are  
11 you going to keep from contaminating the Great  
12 Miami River? I don't see why all the money doesn't  
13 go -- my priority is the wellhead protection  
14 program, which at this time I feel is the better  
15 decision, but then I look back and I say, well, why  
16 do we need a well protection program, wellhead  
17 protection, when our water is contaminated  
18 already. This is, the well protection program is  
19 to prevent commercial companies and industries from  
20 polluting our drinking water. Now, ours is already  
21 contaminated, so how are we going to solve it with  
22 the wellhead protection program?

23 MR. SARIC: I think, for both of  
24 your questions, first of all the \$150,000 is going

1 to cover both programs, I think both wellhead  
2 protection and the Great Miami River cleanup. When  
3 we solicited comments for a recommendation from the  
4 public for what would be necessary for the  
5 supplemental environmental project, I can't  
6 remember the exact number of inquiries we had, by  
7 far the majority of them were suggesting a Great  
8 Miami River cleanup, so we felt that was generally  
9 from the public the majority of the consensus we  
10 got, that we wanted to get the money going towards  
11 that.

12 MS. CRAWFORD: Can I interject  
13 something, Jim?

14 MR. SARIC: Yeah.

15 MS. CRAWFORD: I think that survey  
16 was very misleading, and some people didn't get it,  
17 which is neither here nor there, but I think when  
18 people talked in their surveys about cleaning up  
19 the river, I think there's a misconception of  
20 cleaning the banks. I think -- I don't think  
21 that's what people meant. I mean, I think people  
22 meant getting the shit out of the water, getting  
23 the uranium out of the water, not letting Mound  
24 dump petroleum and tritium and God knows what else

1 into the river. That's what I think people were  
2 talking about cleaning up the river, not pulling  
3 tires off the banks or garbage or cars or  
4 whatever. And I think there's been a really bad  
5 misconception here. You know, maybe it's too late  
6 for us to go back and re-establish or whatever, but  
7 I really wish, and I mean I think I said this a  
8 couple of different times, that we've had a  
9 misconception here.

10 MR. SARIC: We'll go back and I will  
11 talk to folks at DOE and we'll look back into  
12 this. As far as your other question regarding the  
13 -- we'll look at the Great Miami River cleanup, if  
14 we have a problem with that, there's something else  
15 we can do. I'll go back and look at the comments.  
16 As far as the wellhead protection program, DOE  
17 really brought that up and it's something they  
18 want. We're concerned about even if we clean up  
19 certain areas of groundwater, the contaminated  
20 rivers in the vicinity of the site that aren't  
21 contaminated, the groundwater is not contaminated,  
22 and the wellhead protection program looks at future  
23 potential contamination, and I think that's what  
24 we're concerned about.

1 MS. YOCUM: That's what I figure,  
2 but still it was just the thought of it at the very  
3 beginning, just thinking about a wellhead  
4 protection program for our contaminated water and  
5 knowing what the wellhead protection program is  
6 supposed to be, it just seemed kind of incidental,  
7 silly. Well, that's all I have.

8 MS. DASTILLUNG: Could Jack, I  
9 guess, clarify in the Fernald Project Cleanup  
10 Report they talk about vitrification several  
11 places, you've got IT doing vitrification studies,  
12 and you have this MAWS, and then later on you had  
13 Pacific Northwest Lab, they're all doing  
14 vitrification studies. Can you explain why so many  
15 different places are doing what from this it looked  
16 like the same type of thing?

17 MR. CRAIG: They are similar in the  
18 technology, but they're doing different waste  
19 streams, number one, they're working on different  
20 operable units, and some of them have more  
21 expertise in working in certain areas than others.  
22 Pacific Northwest Labs, for instance, have done  
23 some studies on similar K-65 material and  
24 vitrification. That's why they were selected,

1 because of their expertise. It's mostly because of  
2 different waste streams, and essentially that. We  
3 have to look at the different operable units  
4 because of the different waste streams.

5 MS. DASTILLUNG: Do they communicate  
6 with each other at all, or wouldn't that really  
7 help them out?

8 MR. CRAIG: I don't know the answer  
9 to that specifically, but vitrification is I think  
10 a pretty widely known technology, most of the  
11 laboratories around the country know it. As far as  
12 the results of the different studies go, I'm not  
13 sure how that information is being transferred back  
14 and forth between the different people working on  
15 it. Maybe -- Ike, do you want to talk about that?

16 MR. DIGGS: One of the things that  
17 we do, for example, I represent Operable Unit 1, we  
18 have regular technical interchange sessions where  
19 we get the various participants in our treatability  
20 programs together to exchange data, to discuss  
21 problems that they have relative to the studies and  
22 different things that are going on. In our  
23 particular case we are looking at information that  
24 comes both from PNL as well as the MAWS program

1 that you referred to. For example, we know that  
2 the Weldon Spring site has similar waste to what we  
3 have in our waste pit area here. One of the  
4 contractors who was involved with the studies in  
5 Operable Unit 1 has had experience doing studies at  
6 the Weldon Spring site with their waste. So we're  
7 taking advantage of experience and knowledge that  
8 has been developed in other programs in order to  
9 help us not to have to reinvent the wheel in many  
10 cases. So there are opportunities that we have to  
11 get those people together to develop synergism in  
12 our thinking and to help us hopefully come to a  
13 technical solution in a much quicker fashion.

14 MS. DASTILLUNG: Okay. I just  
15 wanted to be sure that with all the money you're  
16 spending, eventually they're going to be cleaning  
17 up other DOE sites too and make sure the  
18 information gets down the line so they won't have  
19 to spend as much time developing as we had to.  
20 Thank you.

21 MS. NUNGESTER: She asked part of my  
22 question here on the vitrification. They have done  
23 work on that in Richland, Washington, Patell has  
24 done some work on that. I've asked several times



1 for some results and nobody seems to give any  
2 results. Also, when Weldon Springs, I think they  
3 had thorium they did some vitrification on that. I  
4 have a question, it seems to me you've done some  
5 sample work vitrification on the K-65 silos, and we  
6 haven't heard anything about the results on that  
7 and, of course, I'm concerned about the waste of  
8 the Manhattan project. I'm not sure whether  
9 anybody else in the country has that except us, but  
10 results on this, I think it's very important that  
11 you share some information with the community.  
12 Maybe you want to include it in one of your schools  
13 or roundtable or community meeting, I don't know  
14 which would be the best forum, but I've asked the  
15 question many times. I've heard that this  
16 vitrification or glass-like material will break  
17 apart in humid, warm conditions, and heaven knows  
18 we have warm, humid conditions here in southwest  
19 Ohio. So I want those questions answered,  
20 Manhattan project, waste material, the thorium that  
21 supposedly was done in Weldon Springs. Also I  
22 think you did some samples on the waste pits, the  
23 material in there, and to have it covered maybe in  
24 one of the schools or a workshop or something.

1 MR. TILLER: We would be glad to do  
2 that. All you have to do is indicate the forum  
3 that you most prefer, and we will provide it to  
4 you. As a point of clarification, PNL, often  
5 called PNL, it's also Patelet Richland, so the lab  
6 you heard being discussed is the same lab. They  
7 were generally considered the experts in  
8 vitrification as it was growing. So we would be  
9 glad to do that.

10 MR. CRAIG: I want to also stress  
11 those studies are not completed yet. The only  
12 study that was completed at Pacific Northwest Lab  
13 was some very small bench-scale studies.

14 MS. NUNGESTER: Those were done in  
15 1982. Does it take 10 years to complete it?

16 MR. CRAIG: That was done in 1988 or  
17 '89.

18 MS. NUNGESTER: There was one done  
19 in 1982. I don't have the information with me.

20 MR. CRAIG: Okay, I'm not aware of  
21 that.

22 MS. DUNN: On the vitrification, if  
23 it's determined that you're going to use that as a  
24 means to do this, would you ship that to Savannah?

1 That plant is not on-line yet for the  
2 vitrification, or would you attempt to construct a  
3 similar facility here at Fernald and, if so, how  
4 long would the construction take to develop that  
5 facility here?

6 MR. TILLER: Let me just say the  
7 process that we're in doesn't allow us to make  
8 those decisions yet. We make those when we get to  
9 a Record of Decision, when we gather the data, have  
10 done the evaluations, probably gone through a NEPA  
11 process. It's nice for us to say we'll ship it to  
12 some dry western state or Savannah River, but that  
13 also takes another process. We can't answer those  
14 questions. What we can tell you is what the  
15 options are today. For example, at West Valley,  
16 which was a facility I had responsibility for  
17 before coming here, they're doing vitrification and  
18 large glass logs. They're clearly carrying two  
19 options: One is to store it on-site until there's  
20 a permanent repository, the other would be perhaps  
21 Savannah River. So those options have to be looked  
22 at, and we do not have the answers today.

23 MS. DUNN: What is the time frame on  
24 construction?

1 MR. TILLER: Well, the records of  
2 decisions that Jack showed, I think there's two  
3 next year, two the following year --

4 MR. CRAIG: The Operable Unit 4  
5 would most probably be the first operable unit, the  
6 K-65 silos, to have a Record of Decision which may  
7 involve vitrification, and I believe that's June of  
8 1994. Sometime after that you talk about  
9 construction.

10 MR. TILLER: I was thinking, we've  
11 got five OU's, and we've got to get the records of  
12 decision in series, and obviously the easiest ones  
13 are first and the OU-3 is last. And the public is  
14 made a part of that process also.

15 MS. CRAWFORD: Ray, you talked about  
16 10,000 drums that you vented, I want you to explain  
17 that to me a little bit more, and I want to know  
18 where you vented them to and what was in them that  
19 you vented?

20 MR. HANSEN: Actually, they were  
21 vented, most of them in the side of the drum under  
22 the lip of the retainer ring on the top of the  
23 drum. Some were vented through the top of the  
24 drum. All of those that were vented that -- we had

1 two types. We vented, those that we vented we  
2 tried to store indoors, those that we could not  
3 store indoors, we stored outdoors and put this  
4 little HEPA filter vent plug in them. Yes, they  
5 were vented to the air.

6 MS. CRAWFORD: And that's hydrogen  
7 that you vented, right?

8 MR. HANSEN: Yes.

9 MS. CRAWFORD: Ten thousand drums  
10 seems like a whole lot of drums.

11 MR. HANSEN: Well, 10,000 drums is a  
12 whole lot of drums, but not compared to all the  
13 drums we have on site.

14 MS. CRAWFORD: It seems like a whole  
15 lot of drums that should be vented at one time is  
16 what I'm saying.

17 MR. HANSEN: This was over a period  
18 of time.

19 MS. CRAWFORD: Oh, you didn't go out  
20 there and do 10,000 at one time?

21 MR. HANSEN: No, no, we didn't do it  
22 over 24 hours, right.

23 MS. CRAWFORD: That's all I wanted  
24 to know. Then I want to know who did the sniffing

1 job?

2 MR. HANSEN: Is there any sniffers  
3 here in the audience?

4 MS. CRAWFORD: Then I want to ask,  
5 was this a promotion or a demotion?

6 MR. HANSEN: No, by sniffing it's a  
7 process of actually applying a tube drawing the  
8 atmosphere of the drum out of the drum and sensing  
9 for hydrogen. We don't have --

10 MS. CRAWFORD: So the person doesn't  
11 go out there and really sniff?

12 MR. HANSEN: With the size of my  
13 nose, I could go out there and really sniff an  
14 awful lot of drums. No, no, this is all  
15 mechanical, I'm sorry.

16 MS. CRAWFORD: I'm not criticizing  
17 you, but in the future I think you should explain  
18 these things. We're all sitting here going  
19 sniffer, what the hell is that?

20 MR. HANSEN: That's a real technical  
21 term.

22 MS. CRAWFORD: See where I work you  
23 get those kind of jobs when you really goof up  
24 really bad. It's called special projects.

1                   The other thing, you talked about  
2 this site-wide characterization report, whatever,  
3 and that is, that will be available to us after  
4 August 5th?

5                   MR. CRAIG: Yes.

6                   MS. CRAWFORD: And we can pick it up  
7 at the PEIC?

8                   MR. CRAIG: It will be in the  
9 Administrative Record, yes.

10                  MS. CRAWFORD: There will be extra  
11 copies for people?

12                  MR. CRAIG: Yes, yes, we can.

13                  MS. CRAWFORD: And we may need a  
14 roundtable on that or something.

15                  MR. CRAIG: Sure. You can suggest  
16 that on your sheets. That would be a good topic.

17                  MS. CRAWFORD: I think Norma's  
18 suggestion on maybe doing a roundtable on the  
19 vitrification, I know it's mentioned in one of the  
20 environmental school courses, but it might be a  
21 good idea to just kind of do a couple of hours just  
22 on vitrification, because, you know, we toured the  
23 Savannah River site, we saw this humongous, God  
24 awful looking building that they're building that's

1 like 20 times over budget and it is going to do all  
2 these fantastic, wonderful things some day, and  
3 maybe somebody could try to explain that, will our  
4 waste be able to go to that vitrification plant,  
5 will it be able to handle stuff like that? These  
6 are all questions that are kind of rolling around  
7 in people's heads.

8 MR. TILLER: We'd be glad to do  
9 that. You want it at a roundtable preferably?

10 MS. CRAWFORD: I think roundtables  
11 are better because that way people who only want to  
12 talk about that come.

13 MR. TILLER: You've got it. It's  
14 fairly specialized, and we would be glad to do  
15 that.

16 MS. CRAWFORD: I don't want you to  
17 hold a big public meeting.

18 MR. WESTERBECK: I think in the  
19 environmental course the process will be talked  
20 about, but to really go into a lot of detail a  
21 roundtable is better.

22 MS. CRAWFORD: That's all I have.

23 MR. TILLER: Other questions,  
24 comments?



1 MS. MERRITT: My name is Maggie  
2 Merritt, and I noticed on your show and tell  
3 displays at the back of the room it talks about an  
4 active and inactive flyash pile, and there's a  
5 piece of machinery that's digging into the ground  
6 and workers are there without facial protection.  
7 Is that earth clean enough for those workers to be  
8 there without protection on their faces?

9 MR. TILLER: I'm going to ask Johnny  
10 Reising to answer that question.

11 MR. REISING: As far as that  
12 activity was concerned, it was basically the 19  
13 boring program that we had where we were dealing  
14 with characterization of that soil and of the  
15 flyash itself, taking samples, going down, doing  
16 augering, and then taking a split spoon sample and  
17 bringing that material back. As that material  
18 comes out, it is monitored by the geologist that is  
19 there that is in charge of the operation. We do  
20 field screening for both H-Nu, which is organics,  
21 the involatiles and those types of materials, in  
22 addition to radiological screening. So screening  
23 is done physically there on-site. If we get beyond  
24 what is referred to as an action level, then

1 certain activities have to take place according to  
2 the health and safety plan. That is either  
3 full-face respirators, lined air, whatever the case  
4 may be. This is all taken into consideration with  
5 the health and safety plan, which is reviewed and  
6 approved and signed off on prior to any activity  
7 taking place whatsoever in the field. So, yes, we  
8 maintain and conduct absolute care of the workers  
9 in the field.

10 MR. TILLER: Thank you, Johnny.

11 MS. MERRITT: We've been exposed to  
12 that flyash pile for years just blowing on us out  
13 here.

14 MR. REISING: Hopefully we're taking  
15 care of that.

16 MS. MERRITT: Another question that  
17 I have. We talked some months ago about the tank  
18 car that's having, that has nitric acid on it, and  
19 it says work plan under development. How long does  
20 it take to develop a plan for something like this?

21 MR. TILLER: Jack is going to answer  
22 the tank car question.

23 MR. CRAIG: Well, we have a schedule  
24 that was submitted to EPA and approved. Maybe Rob

1 can talk a little bit about the actual development  
2 of that work plan, but I can't answer the specific  
3 details in the schedule.

4 MR. JANKE: Well, the schedule for  
5 additional removal actions was submitted to Ohio  
6 and US EPA this past January. It called for a  
7 submittal of the work plan on the nitric acid tank  
8 car in October. Along with that submittal, there  
9 was a number of other removal actions that were  
10 named in addition to nitric acid tank car, and some  
11 of those were even much more complex than nitric  
12 acid tank car, so those activities were started  
13 sooner. In the nitric acid tank car, because of  
14 its complexity, it's relatively simple, we just  
15 recently started, we're due to submit that, as I  
16 said, to EPA in October, and it is on track at this  
17 point. So the actual time for completing the work  
18 plan for that project is probably a month, month  
19 and a half to write the work plan, then we have  
20 some review cycles, and it will go to EPA.

21 MS. MERRITT: Thank you.

22 MR. JANKE: You're welcome.

23 MR. TILLER: Are there other  
24 questions from the floor?

1 MS. NUNGESTER: I would like to go  
2 back to the K-65 silos. My memory isn't the  
3 greatest, I think it's been a couple of years, and  
4 the DOE has done very well with the public  
5 relations, explaining the problems they had getting  
6 those samples out of the center of those silos and  
7 everything. But I read or heard or somewhere that  
8 the samples were completed and you do have the  
9 results. Are you going to make those public of  
10 what you actually found in there?

11 MR. CRAIG: We can do that. The  
12 actual document that those results will be in is  
13 really not scheduled out until I believe April of  
14 next year, but we've also got some other requests  
15 tonight to see what information is available from  
16 that sampling. So I think we're going to try to  
17 put something together, summarizing what the  
18 results were. Hopefully we will have that prior to  
19 the next meeting.

20 MS. NUNGESTER: Thank you.

21 MS. CRAWFORD: You know there was an  
22 article in the paper about that?

23 MR. CRAIG: Right.

24 MR. CONLIFF: This is sort of in the

1 nature of a housekeeping matter, but I've been  
2 having a little trouble following who all exactly  
3 is who, the names and faces change so fast. In the  
4 future maybe it would help, particularly when you  
5 get a new contractor in here and there's going to  
6 be a bunch new faces if people could say who they  
7 were and maybe either give their phone number or  
8 else print up a phone list so that when we have  
9 like questions, we can follow them up to the right  
10 person and --

11 MR. TILLER: We have all those. I  
12 would suggest that we introduce members of the  
13 various organizations so you can put a face with  
14 the name and maybe we even have to introduce  
15 ourselves besides our name, I'm not sure.

16 MR. WESTERBECK: On the individual  
17 fact sheets for the operable units, we do have each  
18 of the DOE operable unit branch chief's name and  
19 phone numbers on there, so if you have a specific  
20 question on an operable unit, you can dial them  
21 right up. And that's primarily the people who got  
22 up and answered a lot of the specific questions on  
23 the operable units are our operable, DOE operable  
24 unit branch chiefs.

1 MS. CRAWFORD: Vicki said you should  
2 put their picture in like a yearbook. When they  
3 leave, we'll put an X through their picture.

4 MR. TILLER: You know, you talk  
5 about new faces and names, as we staff up here from  
6 20 to 50 to maybe 150 to 200, that is going to be a  
7 continuing process, and, believe me, the confusion  
8 is not going to be limited to only those on the  
9 outside. As we grow on the inside and assume new  
10 roles and do a better job at some roles that we  
11 need to do better, the people in the organization  
12 will also have to become accustomed to our  
13 transition. We're gone through not only a  
14 transaction with ERMIC, we're going through a  
15 transition in the DOE office. Anyone here from the  
16 Department of Energy that's confused, please raise  
17 your hand. Don't you dare. No, we're going  
18 through a transition, and that will continue for a  
19 couple of years.

20 MS. CRAWFORD: We're not going  
21 through a transition.

22 MR. TILLER: So you don't have to  
23 put your pictures out with names.

24 MS. CRAWFORD: You've probably got

1 our pictures on file somewhere anyway, so it  
2 doesn't matter.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's a dart  
4 board probably.

5 MR. TILLER: Are there other  
6 questions or comments?

7 Going once, going twice, gone. Thank  
8 you very much.

9 - - -

10 HEARING CONCLUDED AT 9:05 P.M.

11 - - -

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

## 1 C E R T I F I C A T E

2 I, LOIS A. ROELL, RPR, the undersigned, a  
3 notary public-court reporter, do hereby certify  
4 that at the time and place stated herein, I  
5 recorded in stenotypy and thereafter had  
6 transcribed with computer-aided transcription the  
7 within (86) eighty-six pages, and that the  
8 foregoing transcript of proceedings is a complete  
9 and accurate report of my said stenotypy notes.

10

11

12

13 MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: LOIS A. ROELL, RPR

14 AUGUST 12, 1992. NOTARY PUBLIC-STATE OF OHIO

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Spangler Reporting Services

(513) 381-3330



